

FILED - USDC -NH  
2024 MAY 29 AM 9:42

9093

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Josephine Amatucci

v.

Stuart chase, Mullen and Laplante in his  
individual status,

JURISDICTION

1. This action is broght pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1983, Jurisdiction founded upon 28 U.S.,C. 1331 . and aforementioned statutory provision.

PARTIES

2. Plaintiff Josephine Amatucci is a citizen of the United States and a resident of Wolbefore, New Hampshire.

3. Stuart Chase, the former police chief, is being sued in his official as well as his individual capacities.

4. The Wolfeboro Police Department

5. Judge Joseph Laplante in his INDIVIDUAL STATUS

6. Attorney Daniel J. Mullen Ransmeier & Spellman, 1 Capitol St. Ste 1, Concord, NH 03301.

9094

this is all about fraud, fraudulent misrepresentation

fraud is never final

1. Please refer to the evidence before the Court in this case, of an unlawful PROSECUTION FOR SPEEDING, a violation of the Sixth Amendment and a Monell claim.
2. ~~1.~~ Proof before the Court of a statement by Chase stating "UNDER OATH" that the Plaintiff was INDEED PROSECUTED FOR SPEEDING, where defendants are all denying that she was prosecuted for speeding, speeding is NOT A CRIME IN NEW HAMPSHIRE, one does not ordinarily get prosecuted for speeding. Besides the trial court judge found the Plaintiff Josephine Amatucci was....."NOT GUILTY FOR SPEEDING".
3. That the judge found that the pursuit of the Plaintiff by Chase and the police, was a set-up to stop her from arriving at the Sheriff's office where she was going to file a complaint against Chase, et al. And the Deputy Sheriff stated in an Affidavit of the event, that he was told by the police that the Plaintiff was....." NOT SPEEDING" but that the police just wanted to speak to her. Besides the fact that the trial court judge found under evidence in the police log, that her pursuit by the police was a set-up by the police, to stop the Plaintiff from reaching the Sheriff's office where they knew she was going to file a complaint to the Sheriff's Dept. about the offenses against her by Chase and Rondeau. Don't forget the crime by Chase when he went inside my car when I was in the jailhouse, and he stole the evidence I had against the former Police Chief Stuart Chase, WITHOUT A WARRANT, you want proof,

1 2

he doesn't deny it, he went to Attorney General's Office for help, and they sent Dick Tracey down to investigate my complaints, and you want proof of the violations of my Constitutional Rights, how about a copy of the telephone call Tracey made to my son threatening me, by telling my son Anthony, that if I don't stop accusing Chase, he will have MY LICENSE TO DRIVE REVOKED.. Try to deny all this evidence of the violations of my Civil Rights.

4. A combination of the crimes of an false and unlawful pursuit , areest and incarceration, violation of her Liberty Rights, a Fourth Amendment and Fourteenth Amendment violation, a Sixth Amendment violation due to the fact that the trial for the unlawful prosecution for speeding and the prosecution for disobeying a police officer, was held way beyond the time limits allowed for a trial after one has been detained by the police. Making the rulings of the trial court judge on her claim of disobeying a police officer, VOID OF NO LEGAL FORCE. And there is the Monell claim, where Chase a policymaking official committed this crime against the Plaintiff, makes the Town of Wolfeboro liable for the crimes against the Plaintiff. even for one events, as verified in the case of Pembauer v. City of Cincinnati, where the Court stated if the decision by a municipal policymaking to adopt a particular course of action is directed by those who establish government policy (Chase and the Prosecutor) then the municipality is equally responsible whether the action is to be taken only once or to be taken repeatedly.

5. All evidence of a violation of her Fourth Amendment rights and under Due process, and a violation of the Sixth Amendment and under a MONELL claim, where the Town of Wolfeboro is liable for the acts of Chase. ALL EVIDENCE WHICH WHICH THE PLAINTIFF SUBMITTED, AND IS BEFORE THE COURT.

6. Then there is the unlawful Summary Judgment allowed to the defendants by Laplante, when Laplante ignored the Plaintiff's Complaint of an unlawful prosecution for speeding in her lawsuit, and deceitfully and maliciously allowed the defendants summary judgment based on the right of the police to "STOP" the Plaintiff for disobeying a police officer, and never ruling on, ignoring the Plaintiff's Complaint of the unlawful malicious prosecution for speeding, a violation of the Sixth Amendment, especially where the Plaintiff was an elderly person, where a trial must be given at a certain period of time, and the violation of the Fourth and Fourteenth Federal Constitution.

And don't forget, the trial court judge found the Plaintiff NOT NOT NOT GUILTY OF SPEEDING. Unlawful detentions of her liberty rights in violation of the Sixth Amendment.

7. That under the law of the land, under the Federal Constituion any decision, any ruling, any procedure, of this Court cannot will/not OVERRIDE the LAW OF THE LAND. Or they will be TRESPASSERS, of the LAW OF THE LAND, trespassors of the Plaintiff's Federal Constitutional Rights as allowed under 1983.


WHEREFORE, This Court will move this case without further delay to a jury trial of her peers for damages for the violations of her Civil Rights. Or there will be a TRESPASSING OF THE LAW OF THE LAND.

Respectfully,

Josephine Amatucci

c. Town of Wolfboro, Ransmeier & Spellman, Stuart Chase

May 28, 2024



*Josephine Amato*  
PO Box 272  
Wolfeboro Falls, NH 03896

MANCHESTER NH 030

28 MAY 2024 PM 3 L



*United States District Court  
District of New Hampshire  
Office of the Clerk  
55 Pleasant Street  
Room 110  
Concord, N.H. 03301*

03301-394135

